HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 3 Wednesday, January 21, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

IKE: *Anatomy of a crusade* (page 1)

CLERGY: *Poling vs. Mikoyan* (page 2)

Majority oppose Red China (page 4)

DEMOCRATS: *How Alford got in* (page 2)

A-TESTS: *Why they must go on* (page 3)

Crusade in America: Washington compares Eisenhower's drive against inflation and for a balanced Budget with his campaign of 1943-'45 against Nazi Germany. He called his World War II campaign, in the title of his book, *Crusade in Europe*. So great are the stakes now that the Capital has dubbed Ike's current struggle, "Crusade in America."

Veteran observers, however, believe the President faces a much tougher opposition than he realizes—all the special interests, welfare-state wasters, "liberals" of all complexions, labor bosses, quick-buck businessmen, money-hungry politicos, *etc.*

He also suffers from some personal liabilities, of which he may or may not be sufficiently conscious. While he's the President—and that's a great position for leadership in an "honest dollar" crusade—nevertheless his personal popularity has descended considerably in the past two years. Also, in heading up a drive for a balanced Budget, he's a little late. Better late than never, is the comment, but many people are aware that two years ago he overruled the wise counsel of his Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, and went all out for spending. That was a time when the country obviously wanted Budget paring, poured letters demanding spending cuts into Congress. Ike did not respond and the mood passed.

The President faces a difficult task in attempting to revive this mood of 1957. Old hands around Washington doubt that a few "fireside chats" on TV will prove sufficient to revivify popular thinking. Lib-lab columnists and propagandists have so befuddled many of the people that they fail to realize clearly the connection between budget-balancing and stabilizing the dollar. Only a nation-wide public-relations campaign (suggested to Ike by retiring Secretary Weeks), on a grand scale, with special technical means used to pictorialize the problem for the average man, can adequately perform the job.

While the middle classes remain aroused about inflation and understand its relationship to unbalanced Budgets, wage earners sense the trouble but do not get the whole picture. Public opinion pollster Samuel Lubell, in a column last year (Washington Daily News, *June 18, 1958), reported the dismay of various inflation-burdened citizens in a sampling of quotes from workers in industrial areas, who told him: "If wages go up prices go up too and no one is better off"; "I'm fed up with playing leapfrog with prices and wages"; "it would be better to bring prices down than to jack wages up"; "raising wages only jacks up prices";* etc. *But no comments on budgetary unbalance.*

The "fireside chat" technique now being suggested as a method for reaching mass audiences on the need for fiscal integrity was originated by Franklin D. Roosevelt. But Roosevelt, as the years passed, turned to public-relations campaigns to supplement his chats and to affect public opinion. He inspired and utilized "letterhead" committees, well-financed and staffed with good publicity men.

A "letterhead" group of public figures attached to sound American principles, sponsoring the present "Crusade in America," tapping large funds and employing them skillfully through the best Madison Avenue technicians, could supplement the President's appeals with considerable effect. A nation saturated with such ideas would inevitably have its impact on the "liberal" leadership of Congress.

Such a group does exist. It is "Americans for Constitutional Action," headed by Admiral Ben Moreell, until recently Chairman of the Board of Jones & Laughlin Steel. The President could enlarge this group with many nationally known figures from all walks of life. At any rate, kibitzers in Washington offer such ideas to facilitate the "Crusade in America."

Labor Front: Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) warned, more than a week ago, that if the Eisenhower Administration failed to send a tougher labor-reform bill to Congress, he would submit his own measure. The Administration subsequently caved in; Goldwater and Secretary of Labor Mitchell got together and produced a compromise bill which is much sterner than the Administration's offering of last year.

Goldwater and Mitchell served notice that they will demand provisions to deal with secondary boycotts and with coercive ("blackmail") picketing. The latter clause is designed to block Jimmy Hoffa's habit of picketing to compel recognition of his Teamsters Union, when a majority of the workers in the plant picketed do not want his services. Also, the Goldwater-Mitchell proposal would crack down—through drastic penalties—on disregard for financial responsibility by union officers.

On most points the militant Arizonan forced the Administration to sponsor much tougher legislation than it did last year, although he did not get the Secretary to go along with him on legislation to curb union political activities, or on placing unions under the anti-trust laws.

Such omissions in the reform proposals, however, will reappear in other bills. Goldwater says he will individually offer a measure to curb union political

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activities. And it is rumored that Senator John McClellan (D.-Ark.) is working on a measure of his own to bring the unions under the control of the anti-trust laws.

Mikoyan: The triumphal progress of Anastas Mikoyan through the metropolitan centers of America is a giant step forward in the Soviet "peace" campaign to soften Western resistance to Red aggression, and a huge propaganda coup for the top Communist functionary. Papers in West Europe have given tremendous play to Mikoyan's reception in the US. And in the USSR itself, press and radio have used his visit to shore up the regime's respectability, and to convince the enslaved Russian people that Mikoyan is honored among the people of the West. (Communist coverage, naturally, has omitted mention of the hostile crowds of pickets that have dogged Mikoyan at almost every port of call.)

The attendance of many American businessmen at functions for the Russian has drawn Capital criticism. If these businessmen fail to see the pro-Communist political implications of their reception of Mikoyan, it is said, this is a bad augury for their conduct in the developing business-in-politics movement.

Meanwhile, hostile and influential voices have been raised to condemn the Mikoyan visit. Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) uttered sharp words of disapproval last week when some of his fellow Senators dined with Mikoyan. "I am deeply disturbed," said Bridges, "that some of my congressional colleagues have considered Deputy Premier Mikoyan a fit subject for social fraternization." The Nation's legislators, he said, might better follow the example of Cardinal Cushing, Catholic Archbishop of Boston, who flatly declared: "I shall not receive Mikoyan, nor attend any function in his honor," and who added that "the coming of Mikoyan is for the purpose of persuading the United States to build up Soviet defense, thus making it more imperative that we in turn build up . . . higher taxes for our own defense." The Cardinal's course toward the Soviet Premier, Bridges added, "is one that I already set up myself when I received social invitations involving Mikoyan. . . . "

"I will continue to do my utmost," concluded the New Hampshire Senator, "to convey to [the enslaved people of Russia] that the trust which they bear in their never-ending struggle for freedom still shines brightly in the eyes of the vast majority of the people of this Nation."

● Other clerical figures in the US have seconded the sentiments that Bridges quoted from Cardinal Cushing. Last week, the Rev. Daniel A. Poling, editor of *The Christian Herald* and a staunch anti-Communist, gave this exclusive statement to HUMAN EVENTS:

"Specifically, I regret the rock-throwing, egg-throwing, and the screaming of unruly crowds. This is bad publicity for us at home and abroad. But I even more regret the invitation that brought this particular man to our shores. There the trouble centers. He was the last man but one who should have received that invitation. He ordered in the tanks on the Hungarians. His hands are red hands. Is it reasonable to expect those whose relatives and friends were crushed under the Russian tanks, or liquidated—without trial, or after trials that brought pledges of safe conduct—is it reasonable to expect them not to cry out?

"I take my personal stand with Congressman Walter Judd, who threw back Eric Johnston's invitation, and said in effect that he would as soon have social intercourse with Nero or Genghis Khan or Hitler."

● *A footnote to the dinner last week at which a group of left-wing labor leaders paid homage to Mikoyan: in order to attend the fete, UAW boss Walter Reuther, high priest in the cult of strike and picket line, himself crossed a phalanx of pickets to get to his engagement with the Soviet boss.*

● Capital Republicans rebuke the numerous Democratic legislators clamoring for trade and other agreements with the Soviets. Cited as an authoritative judgment on Red duplicity is this quote from an official Senate report: "You must be a liar, a cheat, and probably a spy before you can represent a Communist nation in international diplomacy. You must have no more regard for honor when you sign an agreement on behalf of your country than a forger does when he puts his name on a check."

This statement was contained in a report by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, an offspring of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Members of the parent committee at the time this report was drawn—who authorized a printing of 12,500 additional copies of it—included Democratic Senators Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney and Neely. Does the Democratic party, ask Republicans, now repudiate the sentiments endorsed by its own Senators in 1956?

Democratic Disunity: The cement applied by Speaker Rayburn to the facade of Democratic unity is beginning to crack. As a case in point, HUMAN EVENTS exclusively reports the lowdown on how one situation confronting Speaker Rayburn was at last tortuously resolved.

Dr. Dale Alford, write-in candidate in the Arkansas Congressional District comprising Little Rock, reached a Washington filled with press speculation that the new "liberal" Congress would deny him a seat. Alford, a segregationist, won a surprise victory over "moderate" Representative Brooks Hays in the November election, after strong backing from forces sympathetic to Governor Orval Faubus. The Northern press waged a strong campaign to exclude Alford. Suddenly, at the opening of Congress, Rayburn decreed that Alford be sworn in after other members had taken the oath, thereby reducing his seniority rating. But the fact remained that he took his seat, despite "liberal" opposition, and Rayburn was given credit for firm leadership in accomplishing this outcome. Actually, as sources from Southern Democratic delegations relay the facts to HUMAN EVENTS, Rayburn had to give in with a pistol pointed at his head.

Southern Democrats went to the Speaker and served notice on him that if he presumed to challenge Alford's right to take his seat, the Southerners would move to challenge one of the most important Northern "liberal" Democratic wheel horses: Representative William F.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Green, Jr., Democratic boss of Philadelphia and one of the high-rating Congressmen on the scoresheet of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action.

Almost a year ago, in its issue of February 24, 1958, HUMAN EVENTS reported that a Federal judge had ordered Green to stand trial on charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government, in a deal involving a $33 million Federal installation. Last week, Green went on trial in Lewisburg, Pa., for conspiring, as the AP put it, "to defraud the United States by selling the power and influence of his office."

With such a background, the argument of the Southern Democrats sitting in Rayburn's office carried force. The Speaker capitulated, paved the way for Alford's admittance to the House and presumably stilled the clamor of the "liberal" columnists.

Incidentally, in House cloakrooms, Green, the Democratic boss of Philadelphia, is identified as the man who insured the election of Hugh Scott, GOP candidate for the Senate in the Keystone State last November. Green had engaged in a bitter feud with Scott's opponent, Democratic Governor George Leader, over the past four years, and, as part of that wrangle, contributed decisively to Leader's defeat.

Democrats—Traditional Spenders: As the new session starts rolling, the Democratic leaders (Johnson in the Senate, Rayburn in the House) speak softly, but carry a big stick. The stick, which they will soon begin to wield, is spending. The pose of "moderation" struck by Johnson and Rayburn is not taken at face value by Capitol Hill observers, who believe the predominant "liberal" wing of the Democratic party will push towards new goals of expenditures in education, housing and other "welfare" fields.

Conservative Republicans, wary of the "moderate" guise of the Democratic leaders, are digging up some history to prove the traditional role of the Democrats as the party of big spending. Senator Thomas E. Martin (R.-Iowa) has made a study of this subject, and comes up with the following:

The present two-party system came into existence 104 years ago. In the intervening time Democrats have controlled both branches of the Congress in 34 years. In only seven years have they balanced the Budget, while they have created deficits in 27 years.

The Republicans have established a much better record. The GOP controlled both branches of Congress in a total of 48 of the 104 years. They legislated Budgetary surpluses in 31 years, with deficits in only 17. In this century-long period, Congress was divided, with Democrats controlling one of its branches and Republicans the other, for a total of 22 years. In these years there were 17 balanced Budgets and five deficits. Martin sums up: "Only seven balanced Budgets in 34 years of power does not give the Democrats a very enviable record of fiscal responsibility."

The Iowan took occasion also to call attention to the record of the two major parties on increasing Federal income taxes. The Federal income tax law was enacted in 1913. Since that year, income tax rates have been raised by Congress in 15 different years; in 13 of those years, Democrats controlled both houses of Congress, and in another they controlled the House of Representatives, where all tax laws must originate. In only one year—1930, a Depression year—did the Republicans, in control of both Houses, increase the rates.

Furthermore, of ten income-tax decreases effected by Congress since 1913, nine were enacted in years when Republicans controlled both Houses of Congress; and only one was enacted by a Democratic Congress.

Eruption in New Jersey: Repercussions of the so-called "liberal" GOP revolt in the US Senate, aimed at defeating Senator Everett Dirksen (candidate of the conservative majority), have begun to appear throughout the country—notably in New Jersey.

Republicans, aroused at the attempt by a group of Dewey-Rockefeller "liberals" in New York to finance and put over the revolt, are reacting against the Senators who supported it. In the New Jersey GOP—long torn by dissension between "liberals" and conservatives—numerous Republicans are strongly criticizing Senator Clifford Case of that state for his role in the attempted coup.

Prominent among these Republicans is a well-known industrialist, General Robert W. Johnson, chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson (New Brunswick), one of America's leading pharmaceutical firms. Johnson publicly charged last week that Case's actions would disintegrate the Republican party on a national level as it had in New Jersey. Johnson said, in a letter to Case:

"Certainly your election in New Jersey [in 1954] was in no sense a mandate in support of your leftish leaning. However, you have chosen your course. Those of us who hold opposite views may now throw aside such deterrents as conditions imposed in the past. You have made it vitally necessary for those who believe in the philosophy of our forefathers to defend themselves."

When the General's letter was published in New Jersey newspapers it brought what was described as an "avalanche" of mail not only from people in the state, but also from other parts of the country.

Inasmuch as General Johnson originally backed Case for nomination and election, and as his name and high standing have considerable effect on the opinions of the rank and file, many Garden State politicos now believe that Case will face heavy opposition for renomination in 1960. One possible opponent is said to be former Judge Robert Morris, a rising GOP figure in New Jersey. Morris, who won national reputation as a Red-hunter when he was counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in Washington, is the author of *No Wonder We are Losing,* reviewed in HUMAN EVENTS for February 17, 1958. Morris enjoys much support among regular Republicans in New Jersey.

Nuclear Tests: Worried experts on atomic policy, for a number of reasons, have for many months expressed concern over America's persistent efforts to arrange for a permanent ban on nuclear testing. (The United States voluntarily stopped all tests, for an unspecified

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period, last October 31.) One of the reasons, as pointed out in HUMAN EVENTS for December 22, 1958, is that further tests are necessary for the development of weapons to counterbalance the Soviet Union's massive preponderance in conventional arms. HUMAN EVENTS first called attention to the dangers of this kind of nuclear sellout in its issue of June 9, 1958. This publication then reported that steps were under way to subvert the US policy of opposing a test ban—a policy based on the grounds that proper controls could not be enforced.

Chief representative of the view that a ban was unworkable was Dr. Edward Teller, who wrote in his book, *Our Nuclear Future,* that a test ban could not be enforced because "such tests can be effectively hidden if appropriate care is taken to hide them. There can be no doubt that this is possible." For holding this view, he was castigated by left-wing scientists, who claimed, among other things, that seismographic readings could distinguish atomic tests from earthquakes, and thus prevent hidden underground testing.

Last week, Teller's position was thoroughly vindicated. A United Press dispatch told the story succinctly: "Two US atomic explosions which unexpectedly mimicked earthquakes may have torpedoed chances of an international nuclear test ban. They have also raised the possibility that the Russians, while engaged in test-ban talks at Geneva, could be conducting secret underground atomic experiments unsuspected by the West. In any event, they have triggered new demands in this country for resumption of US tests aimed at perfecting small nuclear weapons for missile defense and limited warfare.

"The fraudulent behavior of the two atomic explosions was disclosed by official sources as a result of this week's statement by the White House that scientific detection of underground nuclear tests appears to be more difficult than once supposed."

Education: "Liberal" Representative Frank Thompson (D.-N.J.) will superintend this year's drive to enact a massive Federal-aid-to-education bill, providing for over $1 billion in Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries the first year, a sum which would gradually rise to $5 billion annually. This is the measure pushed by the National Education Association (NEA) lobby; and it is deemed noteworthy in the Capital that this bill goes far beyond the supposedly "urgent" requirement—hammered at all last year by Federal aid proponents—of loans to students interested in science.

Thompson, moreover, has announced that he will seek to delete the loyalty oath requirement for college students accepting Federal loans, as presently required under the National Defense Education Act. Capital anti-Communists, however, recall a case which demonstrates the urgent need for such a loyalty oath, if America is not to use its tax money to suicidal purpose. In May, 1949, Fulton Lewis, Jr., disclosed that one Hans Freistadt, a graduate physics student at the University of North Carolina and an avowed Communist, was receiving a $1600 fellowship from the Atomic Energy Commission. Investigation showed that the AEC had an FBI report on Freistadt, but that loyalty oaths were not required of the fellowship recipients. Further investigation by angry members of Congress brought out another case of an admitted Communist receiving a $2000 grant from the Government.

Northern Race Strife: HUMAN EVENTS was among the earliest of publications to explore the suppressed topic of racial strife in the North, now an object of widespread national concern. Many important public figures today are turning their attention to this growing trouble, explored in these pages over 14 months ago. (See "The Most Explosive Race Problem Is In the North," by Morley Cassidy, in HUMAN EVENTS for November 9, 1957; also, "Will New York's Melting Pot Boil Over?" by Alice Furlaud, in the issue of July 14, 1958.) Last week, for example, evangelist Billy Graham had this admonition for a New York audience, on the subject of racial tensions:

"No one should point . . . righteous fingers at anyone else. During our crusade here we learned that there are racial tensions equal to anything found in the South. No one in Chicago or New York should point forth a righteous finger at anyone in the South."

Red China: Definitive evidence was forthcoming last week to shatter the pretense that "Protestantism"—as embodied in the leftist National Council of Churches—favors the admission of Red China to the United Nations. This inference was drawn from a vote last November by the "World Order Study Conference" of the NCC, which advocated US recognition of Peiping. (The Communist *Worker* triumphantly proclaimed that "38 million Protestants" backed recognition for the Red regime; see HUMAN EVENTS for December 1 and 22, 1958.) Exploding this left-wing masquerade was a poll released last week by the Committee of One Million (against the admission of Red China to the UN).

The Committee, spurred by the NCC vote, sent a questionnaire to 45,000 Protestant ministers across the country, asking if they favored US recognition of, or UN membership for, Red China. Out of approximately 9,000 answers received, a landslide vote of 87 per cent expressed opposition to both moves.

"We believe," commented the Committee, "that this poll effectively places the overwhelming majority of the American Protestant community on record in spite of the sentiments of minority groups who seek to speak for them."

FRANKLYN WALTMAN, Former Director of Public Relations, Republican National Committee: "No matter how pressed I am, HUMAN EVENTS is 'must' reading for me each week. It is the only way I can keep abreast these days of what is really going on in Washington—reported and interpreted objectively and in perspective."

MARLON BRANDO, SR.: "HUMAN EVENTS presents facts which enable one to think more clearly on political subjects involving his own and his children's future."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 3 HUMAN EVENTS January 21, 1959
Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Conscription Under Fire

Will Congress Alter America's Draft Law?

By FRANK CHODOROV

IT IS AN historic truism that in preparing for the next war a nation always re-fights the last one. Characteristically, therefore, there is a disposition among our present military, even while building up an arsenal of destructive robots for World War III, to think in terms of Normandy Beach and Okinawa and Inchon; that is, of pitting men against men. Yes, they seem to be saying, the long-range missiles and the swift airplanes delivering destruction to the enemy will make man-to-man fighting obsolete; still, we must have vast armies, just as in the past, and therefore conscription must continue.

There are severe critics of this thesis, even among the military, and it is certain that by next July, when the present draft law expires and comes up for renewal, the cry of "the draft should be abolished" will grow considerably in volume. Leading in that demand will not be the proponents of war by automation, but rather those who, while insisting that an Army is necessary, are equally insistent that a conscript Army is far from adequate.

The latter will draw support from the report of a study made by experts under the chairmanship of Ralph J. Cordiner, president of the General Electric Company. The point of this report is not that the draft should be abolished, but that the draft Army is in dire need of improvement; but the facts and arguments adduced point straight to the conclusion that replacement is preferable to improvement.

The size of the Army, in the next war, will not be the determining factor, these manpower experts assert. More important will be the intensity of the training of each fighting man, training not in marching or KP work, but in the use of the intricate combat weapons coming out of the laboratories. It is getting so that a good soldier must be at least a skilled mechanic, capable if necessary of reading a blueprint and of assembling the gadgetry of war even on the battlefield. That kind of soldier cannot be made out of a two-year conscript. He has at best only served his apprenticeship when his term of service is over.

Furthermore, he is not likely to be a promising apprentice, simply because he comes into the Army unwillingly; his acquisition of learning is handicapped by his disinterestedness. He does not look upon Army service as "involuntary servitude"—as did his forefathers who came to America to avoid conscription—because as long as he can remember he knew that someday he would be called. He is conditioned. Nevertheless, his attitude toward service is a negative one; it is an interruption in his career, a job to do and get over with.

This attitude of reluctant complacence, covering up a suppressed resentment, is rooted in the compulsory character of the conscript's service. The draft Army is characterized by a lack of that *esprit de corps* so essential to an effective fighting unit. The investigators report a dangerously low morale among the conscripts, which does not augur well for their effectiveness in war.

DRAFT-MOTIVATION has affected not only the inductees but also their leadership. One official estimates that 80 per cent of the officers below the rank of General take commissions as an escape from the ranks; the estimate is supported by the fact that 73 per cent of the reserve

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

officers trained on the college campus quit the Army as soon as their compulsory tour of duty is over. That is to say, the drafted private is led by semi-drafted officers and the spirit of involuntarism pervades the Army as a whole.

The Navy and the Air Force, services in which skills are even more important than in the infantry, underscore the undesirability of the draftee by refusing to accept him, as does the highly spirited Marine Corps. They want volunteers only (though, to be sure, they recognize that many of their volunteers are escapees from the less desirable infantry service). But these services also suffer from the common urge of their manpower to get out as soon as possible—perhaps more than does the infantry, because of the greater skills necessary to their proper functioning, skills which cannot possibly be acquired within the period prescribed by law. It seems to take as long, if not longer, to train ground and air crews as it does to build a fighting flying machine, and the loss of such personnel almost as soon as they have learned the rudiments of their crafts can immobilize the expensive machine.

Another charge against continuation of the draft is the waste of the training expense involved. Ninety-seven out of every 100 draftees do not re-enlist, and what they have learned about soldiering goes out with them. The new inductees must start from scratch, and since they too will make tracks in two years, the job of training becomes an expensive treadmill operation. To overcome this loss, it has been urged (in the Cordiner report and by others) to try to keep men in the service by offering larger emoluments; but such increases in pay as Congress has authorized do not seem to hold them; they simply don't like soldiering. Some other approach to the problem of re-enlistment must be found.

The draft has also been attacked on the ground of its unfairness. More than a million boys reach the age of registration, 18, each year, and for eight years they remain subject to the draft call, but the chance of any one of them being inducted is less than one in five; not quite 200,000 a year is the current rate. Deferments are not hard to come by; about 40 per cent of those now callable are in the deferred class. If a boy becomes a father before he reaches the age of 26, and has not been inducted, the chances are that he never will be; unless, of course, war comes. Thus, under the present Universal Military Training and Service Act, the great majority of our young men escape conscription, with the result that the minority who are called rue their hard luck. To this sense of unfairness must be added the uncertainty hanging over the uncalled draftables for years.

ALL THESE arguments will be offered in the debate over renewal of the law in the coming session of Congress. The Administration, it is reported, will argue that continuation of the draft is necessary until the effectiveness of new weapons and the new art of war will have been proved. Also, the phrase "democratic Army" will be invoked, despite the obvious fact that there is nothing democratic about involuntary service; and for further argument it will be contended that any diminution in the size of the Army will have an unfavorable effect on our allies.

But there is reason for discontinuing conscription that goes beyond these practical considerations. It is the psychological effect of a two-year tour of compulsory military service on the youth of the country, an effect that can have a long-range impact on our social and political order. For the training one receives in the Army is conducive to the habitual acceptance of a regimented way of life, and that attitude, developed during one's most receptive period, is not easily shed when the draftee again becomes a civilian.

The course in military mental calisthenics is admittedly intended to produce as nearly as possible a human robot; a good soldier is one who automatically responds to the sergeant's bark. He must rid himself of the habit of making decisions, of the impulse to choose. He is not expected to assume responsibility for himself in any situation—save, possibly in the front lines when death stares him in the face. Where he sleeps, what he wears, his daily menu, the disposition of his waking hours, all the choices that a civilian must make for himself are matters of command.

When a young man becomes inured to a regimen of that kind, his spontaneous reaction to any given situation is to expect an order. That is not true of all ex-soldiers, nor even of soldiers, for some there are who never make the perfect adjustment. But an Army of questioners is not an Army. The essential condition of an effective

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military unit is the elimination of all sense of individuality, the substitution of the "outfit" for the ego. That is the premise, also, of socialism.

What the conscript brings back to civilian life, therefore, can be called a security psychology—an inclination toward being commanded and mothered. It is a matter of experience that when a conscript is discharged it takes him some time before he can reacquire the habit of making decisions for himself, before he can reassume the obligations of manhood. Sometimes, as the record shows, he tries it, finds it too difficult, and re-enlists.

The soldier gripes, and so does the ex-soldier, but the latter has a rationale on which to hang his complaints. Did not society interrupt his career, did he not suffer economic loss as a result of this interruption, did not the Nation put his life in jeopardy for two years? Some recompense in the way of special privilege is due him, as a matter of "right." Whether or not the ex-soldier is entitled to some consideration is not the point; the point is that the mentality of the former serviceman is socialistic; he builds up in his mind a claim against society. Again it should be noted that this is not true of all ex-servicemen, but it is true of enough of them to warrant a generalization.

ASIDE FROM this conditioning process, inherent in conscription, there are built into this military system devices that guarantee the transmogrification of the traditional American way of life into a socialistic order. It begins with the methods employed to encourage enlistment in the services which call for above-average intelligence. The propaganda is markedly devoid of any patriotic appeal; on the other hand, the prospective "volunteer" is offered a variety of something-for-nothing dishes to whet his appetite: "join the Navy and see the world," "prepare yourself for a profitable career," "learn a trade," *etc.* Television propaganda is particularly insidious; its dramatic programs are well-larded with the romance of military life (replete with pretty girls), with its camaraderie and its adventure and its opportunities. Doing one's duty for one's country is played down.

Nor is the prospective conscript permitted to lose sight of the special privileges he will carry back with him into civilian life. While doing his duty—under compulsion—he will be earning a bundle of "rights": to "free" education, to "free" medical service (even for the family he will eventually acquire), to financial help if he decides to go into business, to preferential treatment of his application for a Government job, to a subsidized home. He will have acquired during his two years of compulsory service a most solicitous and affluent godfather—the State.

By simple arithmetic it can be shown that socialized medicine can enter our way of life from an extension of the conscript system. Under the present law every man or woman who has worn the uniform of the United States is entitled to some form of "free" medical service until the end of his days. If universal military service were to become truly universal, in due time a considerable majority of the population would become permanent patients of the Government; the dead-letter "service connected" clause in the present law would be voted out and socialized medicine would become a fact without further legislation.

Add to this inevitability the fact that an increasing body of medical practitioners are indebted to the Government for at least part of their training, or their income, thus acquiring a political attitude toward their profession, and you have a solid underpinning for socialized medicine.

So with other privileges accorded ex-conscripts. Already the sons of former soldiers are under certain conditions entitled to "free" education, to say nothing of the veterans themselves. Again applying the mathematics of universal military service, this practice must lead to federalizing the entire educational system, even to the management of curricula, so that "academic freedom" will become the freedom to teach what the Government prescribes. Again, through the housing privileges enjoyed by ex-conscripts—low interest rates, minuscule down payments and guaranteed mortgages—the Government can by foreclosure proceedings become the national landlord. And through preferential Government employment practices, the civil service can be turned into the private hunting grounds of the burgeoning army of ex-conscripts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, conscription is a broad avenue leading to socialism. This is not to say that its proponents have that purpose in mind; most likely, it does not even occur to them. Nevertheless, the denial of free choice inherent in the institution, plus the practices necessary for its operation, lead directly toward a collectivized society.

Incidentally, we ought not to be surprised at the number of American conscripts who proved easy prey for Communist propaganda when captured in Korea. It is more remarkable that so many were able to resist this heady stuff. The statist propaganda to which they were subjected in their pre-conscript days, plus their inurement to involuntary servitude, prepared them for the post-graduate course received in the prison camps. After all, communism is only advanced socialism.

The abolition of conscription would retard the trend toward collectivism. But, the abolition of conscription does not necessarily mean the abolition of the Army. It is quite true, as the proponents of conscription maintain, that it would be foolhardy to put our trust in mechanized warfare entirely, at this stage. Nobody, except the extreme pacifist or the extreme believer in mechanization, would do away with the soldier. The opposition to conscription insists that militarily the conscript Army is inadequate and wasteful and should be replaced by something far more efficient. The burden of the Cordiner report is that a more efficient Army would be one consisting of men who voluntarily select soldiering as a career and stick to it. That is, though the report does not so describe it, we need a professional Army.

INDEED, IT IS mechanization that calls for an Army of professionals, simply because that kind of warfare cannot be mastered in the short conscript period. Various estimates of the time it takes to train an effective soldier have been made, taking into account the intricacy of technical assignments; over-all, the Air Force insists that "60 per cent of its enlisted structure should consist of personnel with more than four years' service; the Navy desires that 45 per cent of its enlisted force should be in the career category"; and so on. It would be politically impossible, and economically undesirable, to draft men for four or more years of service. Therefore, the report concludes, the inducements for re-enlisting should be made so attractive that men who find Army life to their liking would hesitate to return to civilian life. The inducements, of course, are more pay, increasing with the years of service, and more "fringe" benefits.

But, if more and more men decide to stay in the military business and become proficient in it, what would be the purpose or need of conscription? In fact, a constant influx of amateurs would pose a training problem of proportions and would hamper the Army's development. Therefore, if the recommendation of the study committee is approved and acted upon, the result, without further legislation, would be an Army of professionals and an automatic liquidation of the inadequate conscript Army.

Let us admit that any kind of Army presents a danger to liberty. But, we are dealing with a present emergency, not with a long-run consideration. We are faced with the possibility of war; we know that war, if it comes, will be fought with machinery calling for highly skilled specialists; we believe that the enemy will be deterred from making war upon us if he knows that we have a preponderance of both this machinery and of operators trained in its effective use. This calls for a military composed of dedicated professionals, not raw and unwilling conscripts.

Frank Chodorov is Contributing Editor of HUMAN EVENTS.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "CONSCRIPTION UNDER FIRE" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold sepcrately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED